

REMARKS

The office action of June 29, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 68, and 69 have been amended, claims 6 and 7 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-5, 8, 13-16, and 52-82 thus remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, Applicants note with appreciation the courtesies extended by Examiner Webb and Examiner Nguyen to the undersigned and Mr. Brisnehan during the interview of August 1, 2006. The following addresses various items discussed at the interview.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-8, 13-16, and 52-82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended the claims to present the claims in a more preferred form, and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn. Specifically, independent claims 1, 13, 68, and 69 have been clarified as suggested by the Examiner, so that term “exchanges” is no longer recited in the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5-8, 13-16, 52-58, 60, 61, 63, 65, 68, 69, 71, and 73-82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0236739 (*Borges*on). Claims 59, 62, 64, 66, 67, 70, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Borges*on. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate certain features from dependent claims 5 and 6. Applicants believe that this amendment, made responsive to the discussion during the interview of August 1, 2006, overcomes the *Borges*on reference and all other prior art of record. Additionally, as stated by the Examiner in the Interview Summary of August 1, 2006, “[A]dding claim 5 and 6 into the independent claim...appear[s] to overcome the prior art of record...”

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Borges*on. Independent claims 13, 68, and 69 have each been amended to recite at least one similar

limitation as referred to above with respect to claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Dependent claims 5, 8, 14-16, 52-58, 60, 61, 63, 65, 71, and 73-82 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further based on the additional features recited therein.

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733 accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3184.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 2, 2007

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001